



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,495	03/29/2005	Akira Kuramori	OGW-0360	9156

7590 04/24/2007
Patrick G. Burns - Greer, Burns & Crain, Ltd.
Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

STORMER, RUSSELL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerloff et al in view of Peterson et al.

Gerloff et al discloses a tire and wheel assembly comprising a wheel, a tire, and a run-flat support in the cavity of the tire. The run-flat support shown in figures 9 and 10 includes a friction strip 12 and a lubricant 13 or a guide element 19. As noted in lines 53-61 of column 4, the friction strip as shown in figure 10 may be made of a self-lubricating material such as PTFE, or any other suitable material, and the lubricant or slide means may then be eliminated.

As shown in figure 10, the friction strip 12 may be configured to have at least two convex portions.

Gerloff et al notes that materials other than PTFE can be used for the strip 12, but does not specifically mention a microcapsule-impregnated resin.

Peterson et al teaches a slide element for the slide rail of an endless track vehicle. The slide element such member 21 may be formed from a self-lubrication material, and the material may be lubricant-containing microcapsules dispersed throughout the material. See lines 6-45, and especially lines 21-30, of column 5.

From this teaching it would have been obvious to substitute a self-lubricating material having microcapsules formed therein for the PTFE material friction strip of Gerloff et al as this would have been an effective way to distribute lubricant on the outer surface of the run-flat support of Gerloff et al without having to actually apply a separate lubricant to the support.

Both Gerloff et al and Peterson et al teach the use of self-lubricating materials on the bearing surface of a metal member that is to be in contact with a rotating rubber article and to prevent heat build-up during such contact. Further, Gerloff et al and Peterson et al use the self-lubricating materials in lieu of liquid lubricants because the environments they are used in. It is submitted that Gerloff et al and Peterson et al solve similar problems in similar fields of endeavor.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 3617

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 9, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Peterson et al patent is considered to be analogous art as stated in paragraph 7 of the previous office action, and as repeated in paragraph 3 above. Both references seek to reduce friction between a rubber article and a metal member. Both references use a lubricant or a lubricating material to reduce the friction. Both references solve similar problems, and both references solve problems which are similar to the problem solved by the claimed invention. Peterson et al is, of course silent regarding a wheel/tire assembly or a run-flat assembly, as noted by Applicant, but Peterson et al is used as the secondary reference for its teaching of the use of a specific type of lubricating material.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references show other run-flat assemblies, some of which show convex surfaces on the run-flat devices and others show the use of different lubricants to reduce friction.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 3617

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell D. Stormer whose telephone number is (571) 272-6687. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9 AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Morano can be reached on (571) 272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4/19/07


RUSSELL D. STORMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
4/19/07